UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/686,138 | 10/15/2003 | Brian J. Brown | 03-167US (202.0080001) | 6236 | |
| | 7590 04/01/200 MERON & HUEBSCH | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1221 NICOLLE | | TYSON, MELANIE RUANO | | | |
| SUITE 500 MINNEAPOLI | S, MN 55403 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 3773 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/01/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|--|
| | 10/686,138 | BROWN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Melanie Tyson | 3773 | |

| | Melanie Tyson | 3773 | |
|--|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>02 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS . | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(it Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | 36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be | filed within two months | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | cause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying tl | ne issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: Amending claims 9 and 19 to require the F | RF markers be embedded on "the o | utside surface of the t | |
| second cell" or "on the outside of the peripheral sur would require further consideration. (See 37 CFR | | es not previously pres | entea that |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mphane / monamone (i | 102 024). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.12-19 and 22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 23 and 24. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | I be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773 | /Melanie Tyson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3773 | | |
| | | | |

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Solovay's stent graft with markers that delineate the cells since such a replacement would decrease the physician's ability to precisely place the device adjacent to the right side of the aneurysm. However, Solovay's markers are not being replaced as the applicant argues. Solovay's markers are being modified by the technique taught by Case. That is, the markers would delineate the entire cell, as opposed to just a single strut of the cell. It is the examiner's position that such a modification would actually enhance the physician's ability to precisely position the device by identifying an entire alignment cell as opposed to only a strut of the alignment cell. The applicant further argues that Solovay teaches the markers are on the outside and inside of the first and second cells, thus fails to disclose the markers form generally concentric loops on "an outside surface" of the first and second cells. However, it is the examiner's position that the claim language fails to distinguish between an exterior portion of a stent having an outside surface and an interior portion having an inside surface as argued. The claims simply require concentric loops on an outside surface of the first and second cells, in which Solovay's exterior and interior portions are considered to comprise outside surfaces.